

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 18, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Shannon Pogue and Scott Winter. Planning Commissioner Gary Bliss was excused.

Associate Planner Scott Whyte, Senior Planner John Osterberg, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Planning Services Director Hal Bergsma, Associate Planner Jeff Salvon, Associate Planner Suzanne Carey, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Chairman Voytilla announced that those individuals who are interested in the second agenda item, specifically the Scenic Tree Project, are invited to attend the informational session provided by staff behind the partition in the back of the Council Chambers. Observing that this would provide those interested with an opportunity to review in detail the documents and maps pertaining to this issue, he emphasized that the public is encouraged to participate in this action.

1 **OLD BUSINESS:**

2
3 Chairman Voytilla opened the Public Hearing and read the format for
4 Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning
5 Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of
6 any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in
7 the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date.
8 He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or
9 disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no
10 response.

11
12 **CONTINUANCES:**

13
14 1. **CUP2002-0016 - PILGRIM LUTHERAN CHURCH CHILD CARE:**
15 **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

16 *(Continued from August 28, 2002)*

17 Pilgrim Lutheran Church currently operates a private elementary
18 school between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through
19 Friday. The proposed childcare facility would occupy a portion of the
20 existing classroom space within the church and would operate between
21 the hours of 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The
22 maximum number of children attending the childcare facility at any
23 one time would be fifty, and an area outside the church building, on
24 the north side of SW 12th Avenue, would be fenced and converted to an
25 outdoor play area. A decision for action on the proposed development
26 shall be based upon the CUP approval criteria as listed in Section
27 40.05.15.2.C of the Beaverton Development Code.

28
29 Associate Planner Scott Whyte briefly discussed this proposal,
30 observing that the Public Hearing has been continued from August 28,
31 2002. He described the Staff Memorandum dated September 11, 2002,
32 which identified concerns expressed by the Planning Commission, as
33 follows:

- 34
35 1. *Reciprocal Parking Agreement in Writing;*
36 2. *Clarification as to Classroom Occupancy Limits;*
37 3. *Sight Distance Verification at Exit on SW 12th Street;*
38 4. *Clarification as to Fence Appearance; and*
39 5. *Review of Compliance with Section 60.60.10.6.*

40
41 as well as the responses of both the applicant and staff.

42
43 Mr. Whyte discussed the Reciprocal Parking Agreement, observing
44 that the applicant had addressed this issue and provided two written

documents, as follows: 1) a letter from the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD), dated May 14, 1974, with regard to an easement for parking; and 2) a letter dated September 4, 2002, prepared by *Pilgrim Lutheran Church* and signed by the Supervisor for the Elsie Stuhr Center, with regard to the shared use of parking.

Mr. Whyte addressed the issue of classroom occupancy limits, observing that the requested information was provided in summary on page 4 of this Memorandum, specifically information with regard to previous conditional uses related to expansion of the school.

7:06 p.m. – Bob Barnard arrived.

Mr. Whyte pointed out that quick calculations had determined a building code load occupancy limit of 345 individuals, noting that staff had found no specified limit placed on total classroom enrollment or total occupancy. He pointed out that the current enrollment figure of 215 students, at the ratio of approximately 24 students per class, may be closer to actual limits of classroom occupancy, and that this finding can be made with a better understanding as to the practical uses of classroom space and other factors in place that limit the actual classroom size.

With regard to the issue of sight distance verification at the exit on SW 12th Street, Mr. Whyte mentioned that there had been concern with whether the fence placement would comply with the sight distance standards. He explained that the applicant has made appropriate adjustments to address this issue with regard to the required distance.

Mr. Whyte referred to the issue concerning fence appearance, observing that in order to soften the appearance of the fence, the applicant has also proposed some additional shrubbery in front of the proposed chain link fence.

Mr. Whyte noted that in compliance with Development Code 60.60.10.6, an exhibit has been prepared by the City Transportation Division, noting that this exhibit basically consists of a statement that the ultimate number of trips will not add 20 or more through trips per hour on SW 12th Street, which is a neighborhood route.

Referring to the proposed Conditions of Approval, Mr. Whyte mentioned that there have been some revisions to Conditions of Approval Nos. 3 and 4, as follows:

1 3. Prior to beginning operation of the childcare service, the
2 applicant shall construct a five-foot fence to the location **as**
3 **modified by Exhibit 4 of the Staff Memorandum dated**
4 **September 11, 2002** and design approved by the City for an
5 outdoor play area, as required in Section 60.40.25.8 of the
6 Development Code. **Shrubbery proposed along the site**
7 **frontage of SW 12th Street where shown to the quantity**
8 **and description provided in the applicant's letter**
9 **received September 5, 2002 shall be planted within three**
10 **weeks following fence construction.**

11
12 4. Pursuant to Section 40.05.15.1.F of the Development Code,
13 separate Conditional Use Permit approval shall be required for
14 any future expansion to occupancy associated with the day care
15 facility, or **occupancy** expansion associated with the existing
16 elementary and middle school ~~program, or the introduction of~~
17 ~~any other school program that utilizes church and school~~
18 ~~facilities.~~

19
20 Concluding, Mr. Whyte offered to respond to questions.

21
22 Observing that the Staff Memorandum had been very helpful in
23 addressing his concerns, Commissioner Maks questioned whether the
24 applicant's statement would be considered to be part of the evidence
25 with regard to a land use action.

26
27 Mr. Whyte agreed that an applicant's statement is considered to be
28 part of record, emphasizing that the Planning Commission's decision is
29 based upon the evidence within this public record.

30
31 Commissioner Maks pointed out that any documentation provided by
32 Land Use Consultants and Traffic Engineers would also be considered
33 part of the evidentiary presentation of the applicant, reiterating that
34 this is the information on which a decision of the Planning
35 Commission is based. He requested clarification of whether the Staff
36 Report is also considered to be a part of that evidence to be reviewed
37 and factored into a decision.

38
39 Mr. Whyte concurred with Commissioner Maks' observations with
40 regard to information that is considered evidence with regard to a
41 decision regarding a land use action.

42
43 Commissioner Maks expressed his appreciation of the additional
44 information that had been provided.

1 Mr. Whyte announced that copies of the minutes of the Planning
2 Commission Meeting of January 26, 2000 had been distributed,
3 observing that this meeting had addressed the expansion of the church
4 and school facilities. He pointed out that several statements within
5 these minutes actually refer to the occupancy.

6
7 Commissioner Maks noted that the applicant at that time had indicat-
8 ed that the occupancy would not exceed 240 individuals, and expressed
9 his appreciation to the Traffic Engineer for addressing his concern.

10
11 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification with regard to
12 Condition of Approval No. 5, specifically if the Planning commission
13 approves a maximum occupancy of 50, this amount could be increased
14 or decreased by a decision of the Oregon Employment Department
15 Childcare Division, and whether this would mean that the proposal, as
16 approved, is out of compliance.

17
18 Observing that the Oregon Employment Department Childcare
19 Division has the option of requesting less than the proposed maximum
20 occupancy of 50, Mr. Whyte emphasized that Condition of Approval
21 No. 2 provides that the childcare occupancy shall not exceed 50
22 children at any one time.

23
24 Commissioner Johansen questioned specifically whether the applicant
25 requests that the Oregon Employment Department Childcare Division
26 license a specific number for the occupancy limit.

27
28 Mr. Whyte deferred Commissioner Johansen's question to the
29 applicant, observing that while the facility is currently licensed for 35
30 children, staff understands that they intend to request certification for
31 a maximum of 50 children.

32
33 **APPLICANT:**

34
35 **HELEN HANSON**, representing *Pilgrim Lutheran Church*, pointed
36 out that she would like to offer some additional information with
37 regard to the proposal for the childcare operation at the church. She
38 discussed the availability of private Christian elementary schools
39 within the City of Beaverton, noting that there are only three
40 additional facilities of this nature, as follows:

- 41
42 • *Holy Trinity* on SW Walker Road;
43 • *St. Cecelia's* on SW 5th Street; and
44 • *St. Mary of the Valley* on SW 148th Avenue.

1 Observing that all three of these facilities are currently full, Ms.
2 Hanson emphasized that they are not accepting any additional
3 enrollments at this time. She pointed out that *Holy Trinity*
4 *Elementary* has been in operation since 1962, and has an enrollment of
5 262 students. Noting that *St. Cecelia's* has operated since 1915, she
6 mentioned that this facility has an enrollment of 270 students.
7 Referring to *St. Mary of the Valley*, which has been in operation since
8 1902, she pointed out that this facility has an enrollment of 386
9 students. Emphasizing that all of these schools offer some form of
10 childcare on their sites, she explained that she had attempted to locate
11 information with regard to either Christian or secular childcare
12 centers that provide transportation for day school children.

13
14 Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Hanson to address the applicable
15 criteria.

16
17 Ms. Hanson informed Chairman Voytilla that she is addressing the
18 criteria with regard to the critical shortage of private Christian
19 elementary schools within the City of Beaverton.

20
21 Chairman Voytilla directed Ms. Hanson to specifically address the five
22 issues of concern specified at the previous Public Hearing on August
23 28, 2002.

24
25 Ms. Hanson indicating that she is attempting to address the issue with
26 regard to the enrollment and occupancy of the facility.

27
28 Chairman Voytilla requested clarification of how information with
29 regard to these other facilities addresses the applicable criteria.

30
31 Ms. Hanson reiterated that there is a critical shortage within the City
32 of Beaverton allowing parents to enroll their children in private
33 Christian elementary schools. She emphasized that *Pilgrim Lutheran*
34 *School* is the only such facility that is accepting applications for
35 enrollment at this particular time. She pointed out that although the
36 issue targeted by Commissioner Maks is the traffic, it has been
37 determined that the parents are welcoming this childcare center as
38 providing the opportunity to locate their children together in one
39 facility without having to bus their children around, thereby
40 increasing traffic. She expressed her opinion that the overall burden
41 with regard to traffic in the City of Beaverton would be both
42 significantly lightened and spread out over a greater period of time.

43

1 Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Hanson that she had been instructed
2 to address five particular issues of concern, adding that without pro-
3 viding technical data to support the statement she had just made, this
4 information actually has no bearing on this decision. He pointed out
5 that it is necessary to provide a Traffic Study to support her
6 statements, emphasizing that a Traffic Engineer should prepare a
7 Traffic Study that addresses specific criteria. He suggested that she
8 stick to the five issues outlined by the Planning Commission,
9 requesting that she not further complicate what should be a relatively
10 simple case.

11
12 Referring to the school enrollment and occupancy issue, Ms. Hanson
13 explained that while the pre-school classes have an occupancy
14 limitation of 30 students, there are four sessions of students utilizing
15 those classrooms throughout a period of one week. She noted that
16 while the enrollment might be only 30 students, the occupancy might
17 actually be 80 students. Observing that Kindergarten creates a
18 similar situation, she noted that this level involves two sessions.
19 Pointing out that 18 rooms within the facility can be used for
20 instructional purposes, she noted that two of the smallest rooms are
21 reserved for meetings, leaving a total of 16 classrooms for instructional
22 purposes, rather than the nine indicated in the Staff Report, adding
23 that three of these 16 classrooms have been reserved for the childcare
24 facility. She explained that two of the three Christian schools within
25 the City of Beaverton have established a classroom limit of 30
26 students, adding that the third school has a limit of 28 children per
27 classroom, and that 13 classrooms of 30 students would allow for a
28 total of 390 students for *Pilgrim Lutheran School*. She pointed out
29 that only the Fire Marshall had established any enrollment or
30 occupancy limitations on any of these other schools. Observing that
31 the school had opened its doors in 1965, she explained that there has
32 been an annual increase of approximately five students, emphasizing
33 that it is not anticipated that there would be any massive increases in
34 the future. Concluding, she offered to respond to questions.

35
36 Commissioner Winter requested clarification with regard to the 215
37 students, specifically whether this indicates a total of 24 students per
38 each of the nine grades, rather than a classroom size of 24 students.

39
40 Mr. Whyte advised Commissioner Winter that there with the reference
41 of 24 students per classroom, the total calculation provides for a total
42 of 216 students.

43

1 On question, Ms. Hanson clarified for Commissioner Winter that
2 thirteen classrooms are available for school use.

3
4 Commissioner Maks advised Ms. Hanson that while he understands
5 some of her confusion, occupancy and enrollment are two separate
6 issues, emphasizing that he does not intend to approve any occupancy
7 of greater than 240 students. He pointed out that while the Planning
8 Commission had been concerned with occupancy with regard to the
9 application submitted in the year 2000, he is also more concerned with
10 the occupancy than the enrollment at this time. He pointed out that
11 the application at this time concerns only the 50 students within the
12 childcare center, adding that it is not appropriate to deny any applica-
13 tion based upon another application. He expressed his appreciation of
14 the additional information that had been provided, noting that the
15 document had been very well drafted. Agreeing that this facility
16 provides a benefit to the community, he noted that although every
17 neighborhood wants a school and a church in their neighborhood, they
18 do not want these facilities located right next door to their own home.
19 Concluding, he observed that his questions have been addressed.
20

21 **MIKE BAILEY**, Reverend of *Pilgrim Lutheran Church*, stated that
22 although he has no intention of appearing redundant and repeating
23 information that had already been provided by Ms. Hanson, he would
24 like Commissioner Johansen's question to be addressed.
25

26 Ms. Hanson clarified that in response to Commissioner Johansen's
27 question, she has been in contact with the Oregon Employment
28 Department Childcare Division, adding that they have indicated that
29 they are ready, willing and able to license the facility for 50 children.
30

31 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether the applicant requests
32 licensing for a specific number of children.
33

34 Ms. Hanson advised Commissioner Johansen that the applicant
35 requests licensing for a specific number of students, at which point the
36 Oregon Employment Department Childcare Division analyzes the
37 facility to determine whether all of the requirements with regard to
38 that number of children are met.
39

40 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

41
42 On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this
43 application.
44

1 In response to Commissioner Johansen's question with regard to
2 Development Code Section 60.40.25.8.A relating to Condition of
3 Approval No. 5, Mr. Whyte explained that this actually relates to the
4 submission of requirements for a childcare facility. He clarified that if
5 a conditional use is required, in addition to the typical requirements
6 for a CUP, certain information shall also be supplied for consideration.
7 He noted that this information includes the maximum number of child-
8 en for which the facility is proposed to be licensed, adding that the
9 applicant has provided this information. Observing that staff sees no
10 harm in retaining Condition of Approval No. 5, he pointed out that if
11 eliminated, this issue is also addressed through Condition of Approval
12 No 2, which establishes a limit of 50 children at any one time.

13
14 Commissioner Johansen reiterated that the applicant has proposed not
15 more than 50 students in the childcare facility at any one time, adding
16 that this would provide compliance with that section of the Developent
17 Code while eliminating the need for Condition of Approval No. 5.

18
19 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.
20

21 Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura indicated that he had no
22 comments or questions with regard to this proposal.
23

24 Commissioner Johansen expressed his appreciation of the additional
25 information that had been provided, adding that his questions
26 addressed and he would be willing to support a motion for approval,
27 preferably including the elimination of Condition of Approval No. 5.
28

29 Observing that he had not been in attendance at the previous hearing
30 on August 28, 2002, Commissioner Barnard expressed his intention to
31 abstain from voting on this issue.
32

33 Commissioner Maks stated that after receiving the additional informa-
34 tion, he would support a motion for approval, noting that this action
35 also approves the occupancy of 240 students, as approved in the
36 previous land use action. He emphasized the necessity of considering
37 any potential uses with regard to CUPs. Expressing his opinion that it
38 is redundant, he agreed with Commissioner Johansen's suggestion to
39 eliminate Condition of Approval No. 5, adding that this proposal
40 provides a benefit to the community.
41

42 Chairman Voytilla expressed his support of the proposal, indicating
43 that his questions and concerns had been addressed.
44

1 Observing that he is in support of the application, Commissioner
2 Pogue noted that he would also support the elimination of Condition of
3 Approval No. 5.

4
5 Commissioner Winter concurred with his fellow Commissioners in
6 their support of this application, adding that he appreciates the
7 proposed addition of shrubbery around the fence.

8
9 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Johansen
10 **SECONDED** a motion to approve CUP 2002-0016 – Pilgrim Lutheran
11 Church Childcare Conditional Use Permit, based upon the testimony,
12 reports and exhibits, and new evidence presented during the Public
13 Hearing on the matter, and upon the background facts, findings and
14 conclusions found in the Staff Report dated August 12, 2002, as
15 amended, and Memorandum dated September 11, 2002, including
16 additional information provided at the Public Hearings of August 28,
17 2002 and September 18, 2002, and including Conditions of Approval
18 Nos. 1 through 4, with amendments, as follows:

- 19
20 3. Prior to beginning operation of the childcare service, the
21 applicant shall construct a five-foot fence to the location **as**
22 **modified by Exhibit 4 of the Staff Memorandum dated**
23 **September 11, 2002** and design approved by the City for an
24 outdoor play area, as required in Section 60.40.25.8 of the
25 Development Code. **Shrubbery proposed along the site**
26 **frontage of SW 12th Street where shown to the quantity**
27 **and description provided in the applicant's letter**
28 **received September 5, 2002 shall be planted within three**
29 **weeks following fence construction.**

- 30
31 4. Pursuant to Section 40.05.15.1.F of the Development Code,
32 separate Conditional Use Permit approval shall be required for
33 any future expansion to occupancy associated with the day care
34 facility, or **occupancy** expansion associated with the existing
35 elementary and middle school ~~program, or the introduction of~~
36 ~~any other school program that utilizes church and school~~
37 ~~facilities.~~

38
39 with the deletion of Condition of Approval No. 5, as follows:

- 40
41 ~~5. Pursuant to Section 60.40.25.8.A of the Development code, the~~
42 ~~childcare program shall be licensed by the Oregon Employment~~
43 ~~Department Child Care Division for maximum occupancy of 50~~
44 ~~children.~~

1 Motion **CARRIED** by the following vote:

2
3 **AYES:** Johansen, Maks, Pogue, Voytilla and Winter.

4 **NAYS:** None.

5 **ABSTAIN:** Barnard.

6 **ABSENT:** Bliss

7
8 Chairman Voytilla reiterated that those individuals who are interested
9 in the Scenic Tree Project are welcome to attend the informational
10 session provided by staff behind the partition in the back of the
11 Council Chambers.

12
13 7:44 p.m. – Mr. Winter and Senior Planner John Osterberg left.

14
15 7:44 p.m. to 7:53 p.m. – break.

16
17 **NEW BUSINESS:**

18
19 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

20
21 **A. CPA 2002-0007 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP**
22 **AMENDMENT**

23 **B. CPA 2002-0008 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT**
24 **AMENDMENT**

25
26 This is a request for Planning Commission approval of a City-Initiated
27 amendment to sections of the Comprehensive Plan relating to the
28 identification and protection of natural, scenic and historic resources.
29 As a first step, the City's Significant Natural Resources Map would be
30 amended to show properties on which are located trees, tree corridors
31 and groves deemed to be scenically significant. These properties will
32 be selected from sites inventoried by City staff based on criteria agreed
33 to by the Planning Commission. Previous inventories adopted in 1984,
34 1991 and 1999 that identified significant tree resources would be
35 deleted. Four tree categories --Scenic Trees, Scenic Groves, Scenic
36 Neighborhood Groves, and Scenic Corridors-- would be shown on the
37 map. Additionally, the Plan's text would be amended to add Scenic
38 Tree Project inventory information explaining the significance
39 determination.

40
41 Observing that members of staff are available in the next room to
42 respond to questions, Chairman Voytilla emphasized that the purpose
43 of this Public Hearing is to gather information from the public with
44 regard to these significant resources, specifically trees, within the

1 community. He emphasized that regulations and use of property are
2 not the subject at this time, pointing out that only the inventory and
3 different categories would be discussed at this time. He discussed the
4 process with regard to the Scenic Tree Program, noting that further
5 Public Hearings scheduled in October 2002 would address regulation of
6 this resource. He pointed out that the public is encouraged to
7 participate in this project, adding that while staff would like tonight's
8 testimony to address the south end of the project as much as possible,
9 those individuals who were unable to attend the previous hearing with
10 regard to the north end of the project would be permitted to testify as
11 well. Concluding, he instructed those who wish to testify to complete
12 and submit a yellow testimony card.

13
14 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer introduced new staff member, Associate
15 Planner Suzanne Carey, adding that she would be working on the
16 Scenic Tree Project as well as several other projects.

17
18 Ms. Fryer explained that the proposal for the Scenic Tree Project
19 actually provides for the deletion of the significant, important and
20 other natural area designation within the 1984 map, as well as the
21 Significant Tree Inventory within the 1991 map adopted by the Board
22 of Design Review and the Significant Tree Inventory of Annexed Areas
23 within the 1999 map adopted by the City Council. She noted that this
24 proposal also adds four new scenic resource categories, specifically
25 Groves, Neighborhood Groves, Individual Trees and Corridors, as well
26 as the Scenic Tree Inventory background documents to Volume 3 of the
27 Comprehensive Plan. Observing that staff is utilizing Statewide
28 Planning Goal 5 as the authority for this particular project, she
29 pointed out that this is located in Exhibit 21 of the Staff Report dated
30 August 5, 2002. She noted that there are actually 14 categories within
31 Statewide Planning Goal 5, as follows: 1) Wetlands; 2) Riparian
32 Corridors; 3) Wildlife Habitat; 4) Groundwater Resources; 5) Mineral
33 and Aggregate Resources; 6) Open Spaces; 7) Federal Wild and Scenic
34 Rivers; 8) Oregon Scenic Waterways; 9) Approved Oregon Recreation
35 Trails; 10) Natural Areas; 11) Wilderness Areas; 12) Energy Sources;
36 13) Historic Resources; and 14) Scenic Views and Sites. She noted that
37 Scenic Views and Sites is the category utilized for the Scenic Tree
38 Project, observing that these include lands that are valued for their
39 aesthetic appearance.

40
41 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the Goal 5 process includes four steps, as
42 follows: 1) Inventory; 2) Determination of Significance; 3)
43 Environmental, Social, Economic and Energy (ESEE) Consequences
44 Analysis, which only includes those resources that are designated as

1 significant and determines whether there would be full, partial or no
2 protection of the resource from conflicting uses; and 4) Adoption of a
3 Program, which could include regulations, as well as many other
4 items, including web information, Saturday educational classes, and
5 the mailing of informational literature to property owners with regard
6 to the proper maintenance of their tree resources.

7
8 Observing that the current status of the Scenic Tree Project involves
9 the first evidentiary hearing for the south half, Ms. Fryer noted that it
10 is anticipated that following testimony, this hearing would be
11 continued to October 2, 2002, at which time the Planning Commission
12 would make a preliminary determination with regard to which
13 resources are significant. This determination would then be continued
14 to a future date, potentially November or December of 2002, when new
15 notice would be provided to persons who have testified, NACs, CPOs,
16 and owners of properties containing "significant" resources with regard
17 to the Public Hearing and final decision on the overall project. Noting
18 that staff anticipates that a final decision would be made by June or
19 July of 2003, she pointed out that the new regulations would become
20 effective at that time.

21
22 Ms. Fryer explained that the Goal 5 process requires that the location,
23 quality and quantity of these resources be identified, adding that this
24 inventory includes resources within the City of Beaverton as well as its
25 immediate surroundings. She pointed out that this inventory includes
26 the same boundaries that were included in the Local Wetland
27 Inventory that was completed in 1999, which is basically from
28 Highway 26 south to SW Barrows Road, SW Scholls Ferry Road, SW
29 Hall Boulevard, and SW Taylor's Ferry Road, and from the Multnomah
30 County line over to SW 170th Avenue up to SW Beaverton/ Hillsdale
31 Highway, where it extends to SW 185th Avenue. She emphasized that
32 the inventory would be in effect for those areas that are
33 unincorporated, although there would be no regulatory effect until
34 annexation has occurred.

35
36 Ms. Fryer clarified that Neighborhood Groves can be differentiated
37 from Groves in that they are located in substantially developed areas,
38 with little or no under story species present. She described them as
39 clusters of trees that could be distinguished separately as Individual
40 Trees, although it is difficult due to the density of the resource. She
41 pointed out that these resources are found within developed
42 residential, commercial and industrial tree areas, emphasizing that
43 they could include trees that have been planted. Observing that these
44 resources typically include medium to large sized groupings of trees

1 identified as being of the same or similar species, age, or height that
2 enhance the beauty, character or value of a particular neighborhood or
3 business area, she noted that this classification is often used for areas
4 that have been set aside as tree preservation tracts following
5 development.

6
7 Ms. Fryer discussed Groves, noting that this resource includes native
8 urban forests or large tree clusters, generally with under story species.
9 She pointed out that Groves are found mainly in undeveloped areas,
10 underdeveloped areas, and on public properties.

11
12 Referring to Corridors, Ms. Fryer described this resource as mature
13 rows of trees that frame an area, usually within public rights-of-way,
14 adding that they are generally similar species with a minimum
15 diameter at breast-height of six inches.

16
17 Ms. Fryer discussed Individual Trees, observing that these include
18 specimen trees that stand out within a neighborhood or along streets
19 or other public viewing locations, such as parks or schools. She
20 mentioned that this category also includes some clusters of two or more
21 trees that are grouped closely together or possess similar
22 characteristics, adding that species identification, mature size, overall
23 shape, health and any unique features are considered with regard to
24 this category. She pointed out that unique features could be
25 considered if a tree is featured in the *Beaverton Valley Times* as one of
26 Beaverton's favorite trees.

27
28 Ms. Fryer mentioned eight characteristics were evaluated with regard
29 to Neighborhood Groves, twelve characteristics with regard to Groves,
30 eight characteristics with regard to Corridors, and five characteristics
31 with regard to Individual Trees, noting that these characteristics were
32 all rated high, medium or low.

33
34 Referring to Neighborhood Groves, Ms. Fryer noted that a Work
35 Session with the Planning Commission had determined which
36 characteristics were more significant from an aesthetic point of view
37 with regard to each of the categories. She explained that health,
38 specifically invasive species, stock, and grove edge effect, had been
39 determined to be the three primary characteristics to be considered
40 more important than the other characteristics, adding that this
41 characteristic had been assigned a weight of four. Observing that
42 appearance had been assigned a weight of three, she noted that age
43 had been assigned a weight of two, adding that the remaining

1 characteristics (context, number of trees, and rarity) had not been
2 assigned a weight.

3
4 Referring to Groves, Ms. Fryer indicated that health, specifically
5 invasive species, stock, and grove edge effect, had again been
6 determined to be the three primary characteristics considered to be the
7 most important, and had been assigned a weight of four, adding that
8 appearance had been assigned a weight of three. She pointed out that
9 age had been assigned a weight of two, noting that the remaining
10 characteristics (access, context, number of trees, complexity, diversity,
11 scale and rarity) had not been assigned a weight.

12
13 Ms. Fryer referred to Corridors, observing that appearance had been
14 assigned a weight of four, noting that age, frame and context were
15 weighted three. She mentioned that length, uniformity of size,
16 uniformity of species and native had not been assigned a weight.

17
18 Ms. Fryer discussed Individual Trees, noting that condition and health
19 had received a weighting of four, appearance had received a weighting
20 of three, and age had received a weighting of two, and native or rarity
21 had not received a weighting.

22
23 With regard to a determination of significance in the Statewide
24 Planning Goal 5 process, Ms. Fryer pointed out that it is necessary to
25 determine which inventoried resources are significant. She explained
26 that only those significant resources move on to the next step, adding
27 that the other resources remain on the inventory but are not regulated.
28 She noted that staff recommends resources scoring above average,
29 utilizing the weighted scores for the Neighborhood Groves, Corridors,
30 and Individual Trees Categories for designation as significant,
31 emphasizing that they are recommending that all Grove resources be
32 designated as significant and carried on to the next step to determine
33 ESEE Consequences of either fully, partially or not protecting each
34 resource.

35
36 Ms. Fryer pointed out that the highest possible weighted score for
37 Neighborhood Groves is 60, adding that staff recommends that the
38 greater than average weighted score of 55 be determined as significant.

39
40 Observing that the highest possible weighted score for Groves is 72,
41 Ms. Fryer noted that while the greater than average weighted score is
42 42, staff recommends that all Groves should be determined as
43 significant.

44

1 Ms. Fryer noted that the highest possible weighted score for Corridors
2 is 42, adding that staff recommends that the greater than average
3 weighted score of 34 should be determined as significant.

4
5 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the highest possible weighted score for
6 Individual Trees is 33, noting that staff recommends that the greater
7 than average weighted score of 30 should be determined as significant.

8
9 On question, Ms. Fryer explained to Commissioner Barnard that any
10 score greater than average would be considered significant with regard
11 to Neighborhood Groves, Corridors and Individual Trees, with the
12 exception of Groves, all of which would be considered significant.

13
14 Ms. Fryer explained that from a total of 220 Neighborhood Groves,
15 staff is proposing that 56% (124) would be considered significant.

16
17 Observing that 80% of the Groves are actually greater than average,
18 Ms. Fryer stated that staff is proposing that all 139 of these resources
19 be determined significant.

20
21 Noting that 60% of the Corridors scored greater than average, Ms.
22 Fryer pointed out that staff is proposing that these 27 resources be
23 designated as significant.

24
25 With regard to Individual Trees, Ms. Fryer pointed out that 338 of the
26 507 resources score greater than average, noting that 67% of the total
27 would be designated as significant.

28
29 Ms. Fryer pointed out that the next step involves the ESEE
30 Consequences Analysis, with regard to allowing, limiting, and
31 prohibiting conflicting uses within a resources, as well as the
32 development of a program to implement those decisions.

33
34 Referring to the Staff Report, Ms. Fryer explained that the proposal
35 meets or will meet, upon completion of the ESEE and the program, the
36 six Comprehensive Plan criteria cited in the August 5, 2002, Staff
37 Report.

38
39 Ms. Fryer discussed Supplemental Staff Report No. 1, dated August
40 27, 2002, observing that this document identified a number of issues
41 related to the proposal, specifically an error with regard to notification,
42 adding that several individuals had indicated that they had received
43 only one side of this double-sided notice. She pointed out that staff had
44 mailed an new notice to the individual reporting this oversight, as well

1 as 30 adjacent neighbors, adding that they had also published
2 notification in the newspaper with regard to this issue. She mentioned
3 another issue with regard to telephones calls received indicating that
4 staff had actually missed a portion of the inventory within Exhibit 23,
5 adding that only certain listed tree species within those areas would be
6 included in the inventory. She discussed known tree removals,
7 observing two instances in which certain individuals had removed
8 their trees. She mentioned another issue with regard to certain data
9 corrections, as well as an issue pertaining to letters that had been
10 submitted. She pointed out that a final issue addressed notices that
11 individual property owners had received with regard to tree resources
12 that were not actually located on their properties.

13
14 Ms. Fryer discussed Supplemental Staff Report No. 2, dated
15 September 11, 2002, observing that the Neighborhood Grove species
16 identification at the meeting of September 4, 2002 had been incorrect.
17 Noting that this information has been corrected, she pointed out that
18 the material is within the packets, adding that this information has
19 also been corrected on the website. She pointed out that staff had
20 revised their recommendation with regard to Groves, noting that due
21 to the overall scarcity of groves, as well as concerns that have been
22 expressed over the years with regard to the development within these
23 groves, staff had determined that all of these resources should be
24 determined significant. She explained that the ESEE would provide a
25 method for determining whether full, partial or no protection would be
26 appropriate in each individual case. She discussed an issue with
27 regard to additional resources that had been removed.

28
29 Observing that Supplemental Staff Report No. 3, dated September 18,
30 2002, had been distributed this evening, Ms. Fryer pointed out that the
31 first issue addressed in this document concerns an e-mail submitted by
32 Wes Yuen with regard to Neighborhood Grove 6-02. She mentioned
33 that due to a clerical error, this grove had been referred to as
34 Neighborhood Grove 06-07 within the Staff Report. Noting that staff
35 had met with two of the City Arborists, Pat Hoff and Steve Brennan,
36 out on the site, in an effort to clarify which species exist within this
37 Neighborhood Grove, she pointed out that they had suggested the
38 addition of Western White Pine and Jeffrey Pine to the species list.
39 She mentioned that three Ponderosa Pines located on Mr. Yuen's
40 neighbor's property, within the Neighborhood Grove. She discussed
41 the issue of missing photographs, observing that photographs of
42 several trees had not been included within the packet, and noted that
43 they have been included within this document. With regard to the

1 Plant Species List, she pointed out that duplicate abbreviations had
2 been noted and clarified.

3
4 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the purpose of tonight's hearing is to receive
5 the Staff Report, to receive public testimony primarily with regard to
6 the south half of the study area, and to continue the hearing until
7 October 2, 2002, at which time the Planning Commission would
8 consider the Staff Report and testimony received in order to make a
9 preliminary finding with regard to the inventory and significance.
10 Concluding, she explained that at that time, the hearing would be
11 continued to a date uncertain in order to allow staff to bring the ESEE
12 Analysis and Program together for consideration, and offered to
13 respond to questions.

14
15 Referring to Supplemental Staff Report No. 2, Commissioner Maks
16 noted that he disagrees strongly with staff's recommendation to
17 determine that all Groves should be considered significant, adding that
18 he also feels that it is excessive to determine 56% of the Neighborhood
19 Groves as significant. He discussed regulations concerning significant
20 trees, specifically with regard to preservation of only 5% of these
21 resources. Expressing his opinion that only those trees that are truly
22 significant should receive this rating, he emphasized that these trees
23 that have been designated as significant should receive full protection.

24
25 Chairman Voytilla expressed his agreement with Commissioner Maks,
26 pointing out that some of the resources determined to be significant
27 within the Staff Report do not qualify as significant in his opinion.

28
29 In response to a statement by Commissioner Johansen, Ms. Fryer
30 stated that because the Planning Commission is not responsible for
31 making a final decision at this time through a Planning Commission
32 Order, the project would remain open until adoption of the final order,
33 which would be presented to the City Council for their consideration.

34
35 Commissioner Barnard expressed concern that determining all Groves
36 as significant could generate a great deal of opposition from the public,
37 adding that he is also concerned with creating issues that would have
38 the potential of making some properties undevelopable.

39
40 Commissioner Winter pointed out that he is struggling with
41 attempting to quantify what is essentially a non-quantifiable issue.

42
43 Observing that this determination is based upon the average score,
44 Ms. Fryer explained that the overall breadth of scores for Grove

1 resources had been greater than those of the other resources. She
2 pointed out that while there had been 12 characteristics with regard to
3 Groves, Neighborhood Groves and Corridors had included only eight,
4 and Individual Trees had only provided for five characteristics, noting
5 that the span varied greatly between Groves and the other resources.

6
7 Chairman Voytilla referred to the packet of pictures within
8 Supplemental Staff Report No. 2, specifically G20-05 and G20-06,
9 expressing that the houses are the same and they both appear to be
10 the same grove.

11
12 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that these groves are each
13 located on opposite sides of the power lines.

14
15 Chairman Voytilla expressed his opinion that the photographs are
16 somewhat confusing.

17
18 Ms. Fryer verified that G20-05 and G20-06 are two different groves,
19 noting that the photograph is incorrect and should not have been
20 included.

21
22 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that he had been surprised to note that
23 some of the photographs actually include other elements that identify
24 the location, such as park signs, trails, benches, and picnic tables, etc.
25 He questioned the possibility of superimposing the parklands onto the
26 proposed inventory and providing copies to members of the Planning
27 Commission in order to determine how many of these resources are
28 already in public ownership.

29
30 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that this map is available,
31 adding that it had been posted the previous week, and mentioned that
32 staff had included publicly owned lands such as schools and parks.

33
34 Chairman Voytilla noted that his greatest concern is with parks,
35 observing that this involves community values and issues with regard
36 to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). He pointed out that with no
37 additional lands available in this area for the potential expansion of
38 the UGB, virtually every property that is not a public park would
39 eventually be designated for redevelopment.

40
41 Ms. Fryer pointed out that staff would address this issue through the
42 ESEE Analysis, adding that maps providing this information are
43 available for review.

44

1 Observing that members of staff are available in the next room to
2 respond to questions, Chairman Voytilla pointed out that public
3 testimony, rather than questions, would be accepted at this time,
4 adding that each individual would be limited to five minutes.
5

6 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**
7

8 **JACK KRIEGER** stated that he lives on Greenway Park, adding that
9 his property has been included in Neighborhood Grove NG 27-05.
10 Observing that it is his understanding that these resources are located
11 in substantially undeveloped areas, he pointed out that while this area
12 is substantially undeveloped, his concern is that this area should have
13 instead been included in Grove G 27-01. He mentioned that there
14 were obviously not enough trees in the area for consideration as a
15 Grove, he noted that a lot of the backyard trees that have been planted
16 have been included for consideration as a Neighborhood Grove. He
17 explained that he and many of the neighbors would like to see NG 27-
18 05 blended into Grove G 27-01, emphasizing that the majority of this
19 property is publicly owned (Greenway Park and Greenway Elementary
20 School), rather a privately developed area. Concluding, he expressed
21 his opinion that this would alleviate some of the concerns with regard
22 to this project.
23

24 Ms. Fryer responded that this portion of Greenway Park is more
25 developed, observing that it includes trails and a large playground.
26 Noting that a lot of the area is grass, she pointed out that the majority
27 of the trees proposed to be included in this Neighborhood Grove have
28 been planted. She explained that while a stream corridor runs
29 through the property, the majority of the large trees are not located
30 within this stream corridor. She noted that Grove G 27-01 includes
31 primarily wetland trees and Oregon White Oak, adding that the
32 character of the trees has changed from Grove G 27-01 to
33 Neighborhood Grove NG 27-05.
34

35 Mr. Krieger advised the Planning Commission that the residents of
36 this area do not believe that there are a significant number of trees in
37 there that would justify designation as a Neighborhood Grove,
38 reiterating that they would prefer that these resources be blended into
39 Grove G 27-01, which is all public land.
40

41 Chairman Voytilla questioned whether Mr. Krieger's concern is
42 specifically for his property.
43

1 Agreeing that his concern is specifically with regard to his property,
2 Mr. Krieger suggested that he is one of those individuals to whom
3 Commissioner Maks had referred, emphasizing that he believes that
4 he should be able to make his own decisions with regard to his own
5 trees. He pointed out that his primary objective is to prevent his own
6 trees from being included in a Neighborhood Grove designation.

7
8 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Krieger that the Grove designation
9 would most likely include more stringent regulations than those
10 associated with a Neighborhood Grove.

11
12 Mr. Krieger explained that his suggestion had been to blend the trees
13 in Neighborhood Grove NG 27-05, *up to the back of the property lines of*
14 *the park*, into Grove G 27-01, adding that he had intended to exclude
15 the trees on the property that abuts the park.

16
17 Commissioner Maks reminded Mr. Krieger that Ms. Fryer had stated
18 that a grove is only the identified trees in a grove, observing that this
19 could potentially apply to all, none or only one of his trees.

20
21 Mr. Krieger emphasized that he does not want the trees on his
22 property to be either a Grove or a Neighborhood Grove, questioned
23 whether he would receive any response before final action is taken, and
24 offered to respond to questions.

25
26 Chairman Voytilla urged Mr. Krieger to continue to attend and
27 participate in the hearings with regard to the Tree Inventory.

28
29 **BOB RINGO** stated that he is a resident of Parkwood Highlands,
30 adding that as a property owner, he is extremely concerned with the
31 Planning Commission's implementation process and potential
32 regulations as proposed in this Scenic Tree Project. He pointed out
33 that if the proposed regulations with regard to Neighborhood Groves
34 become law, greater than 50% of his property would be under the
35 control of the City of Beaverton. Observing that the data collected by
36 staff had indicated that some form of tree protection is indicated, he
37 pointed out that this was not the City's comprehensive regulatory
38 process for Neighborhood Groves that had been included on the
39 original questionnaire. He explained that of those questionnaires
40 returned, 29 individuals had supported full protection, 42 individuals
41 had supported partial protection, and 25 individuals had supported no
42 protection, expressing his opinion that based upon this data, nearly
43 70% had supported partial to no protection.

44

1 Mr. Ringo discussed the recently established weighting characteristics
2 with regard to various tree categories, observing that these weighting
3 characteristics for both Groves and Neighborhood Groves are the same.
4 He pointed out that based upon primary objectives in the OAR
5 Planning Goal 5, the protection of natural groves should far outweigh
6 the protection of neighborhood groves. He expressed his opinion that a
7 weighting factor for natural groves, as compared to neighborhood
8 groves, should be far greater, adding that this would provide for an
9 analysis that would provide some form of equitable treatment that
10 acknowledges the difference in resource quality along with the rights
11 of property owners. He noted that within Planning Goal 5, the process
12 appears to be the latitude for the Planning Commission to make an up
13 front decision on the adequacy of information collected and
14 interpretation of findings. He emphasized that no matter how one
15 categorizes or weighs various inventory parameters, there should be a
16 reality check, early on, as to the environmental, social, and economic
17 consequences of the Scenic Tree Project.

18
19 Observing that this involves our tax dollars at work, Mr. Ringo
20 questioned why this project is proceeding if community support is not
21 prevalent. He requested clarification of whether this project is really
22 that vital to the City of Beaverton, particularly when considering the
23 more pressing educational and economic issues facing the community
24 at this time. Noting that he has been working closely with numerous
25 other property owners with regard to this issue, he pointed out that
26 many of these individuals had received no notice concerning the efforts
27 of the Planning Commission on the Scenic Tree Project. Emphasizing
28 that this potential decision would directly involved the property rights
29 of many individuals, he emphasized that it is necessary to ensure as
30 much community involvement as possible before any final decision is
31 reached. He noted that as he has stated previously, the City of
32 Beaverton must not establish regulations with regard to a Scenic Tree
33 Project that would result in either a forfeiture or encroachment upon
34 an individual's property rights, adding that there should be no inequity
35 with regard to the treatment of these rights. He expressed his opinion
36 that an opportunity exists to provide incentive programs that could
37 achieve the same results with regard to tree preservation with a
38 minimum of regulation control for Neighborhood Groves. Noting that
39 he is limited to five minutes, he submitted a document, dated
40 September 18, 2002, containing his comments with regard to
41 Neighborhood Groves. Observing that the individuals who live within
42 these areas are making every attempt to provide adequate
43 maintenance for their trees, he pointed out that this involves a
44 considerable cost to the property owner. He expressed concern that the

1 Planning Commission proposes to increase these costs through
2 additional regulations and monetary penalties, which would serve to
3 create an even greater burden on the property owners. He requested
4 clarification of how a retired person could meet those provisions,
5 emphasizing that they are on a fixed income and often unable to even
6 meet their own medical and prescription costs.

7
8 Chairman Voytilla encouraged Mr. Ringo to attend and participate in
9 future hearings with regard to the Scenic Tree Project, emphasizing
10 that his testimony is very valuable.

11
12 Mr. Ringo emphasized that he is concerned with his property, pointing
13 out that he is opposed to allowing the government to have control over
14 his private property.

15
16 Commissioner Pogue expressed appreciation to Mr. Ringo for his
17 testimony, and requested clarification of his statement indicating that
18 he had not received adequate notification with regard to this project.

19
20 Mr. Ringo advised that his neighbors had not received this notification,
21 observing that when he had personally made the effort to discuss the
22 situation with his neighbors, they had not been aware of the Scenic
23 Tree Project.

24
25 Chairman Voytilla questioned whether Mr. Ringo attends his NAC
26 Meetings.

27
28 Mr. Ringo stated that while he does not currently attend the NAC
29 Meetings, it might be a good idea to start.

30
31 Chairman Voytilla explained that the NAC Meetings serves as one of
32 the methods of outreach offered by the City of Beaverton, adding that a
33 great deal of information is available at these meetings.

34
35 Chairman Voytilla called **PHILLIS KIRSE** to testify. There was no
36 response.

37
38 **CATHERINE ARNOLD** stated that she would like to discuss two
39 more broad issues with regard to the Scenic Tree Project, observing
40 that while Poplar Trees are currently included as a tree that would be
41 considered significant in neighborhoods, she does not feel these trees
42 are appropriate for a neighborhood. Observing that these trees reach a
43 height of greater than 100 feet, she pointed out that they are extremely
44 messy, with extensive roots that have the potential to destroy

1 foundations. Emphasizing that these trees are very difficult to control,
2 she reiterated that they do not provide a good neighborhood tree.
3 Noting that she had discussed this issue with City Arborist Steve
4 Brennan, she pointed out that he had been surprised to learn that
5 Poplar Trees were included in a Neighborhood Grove.

6
7 Ms. Arnold questioned whether there are different types of
8 Neighborhood Groves that might be better served by different types of
9 regulation, information, or education.

10
11 Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Arnold that he does not have this
12 information at this time, emphasizing that this is something that still
13 has to be determined.

14
15 **WILEY WENGER** mentioned that his property is located adjacent to
16 Greenway Park, noting that he is also concerned with Neighborhood
17 Grove NG 27-05. He pointed out that it appears that there are two
18 different types of groves that are designated as Neighborhood Groves,
19 observing that this is confusing in itself. He noted that a remnant
20 grove of Douglas Fir, Pondorosa Pine, or Oregon White Oak involves a
21 group of trees with a basically closed canopy, expressing his opinion
22 that this group of trees could potentially be quite significant. He
23 mentioned that the criteria addresses whether removal of a particular
24 tree affects the edge of the grove, noting that this suggests a group of
25 rather closely grouped trees, rather than trees that are scattered or
26 separated by large open areas, which is the situation in Neighborhood
27 Grove NG 27-05. He pointed out that the majority of that area
28 involves either an open space or a school, noting that some of the
29 pictures depict trees that are not even included in what is referred to
30 as Neighborhood Grove NG 27-05. Concluding, he expressed his
31 opinion that this project has been very badly conceived and evaluated.

32
33 Chairman Voytilla again called **PHILLIS KIRSE** to testify. There
34 was no response.

35
36 Observing that all public testimony has been received, Chairman
37 Voytilla requested a motion with regard to staff's request for a
38 continuance.

39
40 Commissioner Pogue **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks **SECONDED**
41 a motion to continue CPA 2002-0007 – Scenic Tree Project
42 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, to a date certain of October 2,
43 2002.
44

1 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

2

3 Commissioner Pogue **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks **SECONDED**
4 a motion to continue CPA 2002-0008 – Scenic Tree Project
5 Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, to a date certain of October 2,
6 2002.

7

8 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

9

10 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

11

12 Minutes of the meeting of August 28, 2002, submitted. Chairman
13 Voytilla requested that lines 24 through 26 of page 2 be amended, as
14 follows: “Chairman Voytilla commented that ~~in addition to being~~ **he is**
15 very familiar with ~~the~~ **this** site **because he had operated an office**
16 **in the area, adding that** a recent site visit had not resulted in any
17 contact with any individual(s) with regard to this application.”
18 Chairman Voytilla requested that lines 28 through 30 of page 7 be
19 amended, as follows: “...it ~~would be~~ **is** extremely difficult to motivate
20 ~~any individuals~~ **employees** to leave their vehicles and walk a mile
21 **this distance** in order to ride the light rail ~~in any~~ **during foul**
22 weather conditions...” Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and
23 Commissioner Pogue **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
24 approved, as amended.

25

26 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner
27 Barnard, who abstained from voting on this issue.

28

29 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

30

31 Chairman Voytilla observed that because next week’s meeting would
32 only serve as a continuance of CUP 2001-0028 – The Round at
33 Beaverton Central: Planned Unit Development Modification, it would
34 not be necessary for any members of the Planning Commission other
35 than himself to attend.

36

37 The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.